

REMARKS

The Examiner indicates that claims 1, 7-12, 16-19 are allowed.

Claim 12 has been amended to remove reference to “at least one display panel” and replace it by reference to “a display panel”. This is in response to the Examiner’s assertion that more than one display panel was not depicted in the drawings.

Claim 6 is not acknowledge in the Examiner’s final action as being still pending in the application. However, in the response to the Examiner’s first official action, claim 6 was retained in amended form. Claim 1 has been indicated as being allowed, claim 6 is allowable as dependent on allowable base claim 1.

Claim 23 t has been rejected under 35 USC 112 as containing subject matter not described in the specification, namely that the second complementary display unit is mounted on the side of the carry basket. In the specification as filed, at page 3, line 22 to page 4 line 2, there is a clear description of two complementary display units being provided at opposite ends so that there is a basis for claim 23 covering this configuration. Accordingly, claim 23 is retained with an amendment to define that the first display unit is located at a first one of the opposite end walls of the carry basket and that the second complementary display unit is located at the second end which is opposite to the first end having the first display unit.

Drawings:

In paragraph No. 2 of the detailed action under the heading “Drawings” new FIGS. 4 and 5 were rejected because they were said to incorporate new matter.

We enclose new FIGS. 4 and 5 to substitute for the previously lodged new FIGS. 4 and 5.

The Examiner said that the previous proposed new FIG. 4 depicted new matter in showing the display unit being divided into two sub-sections 12a and 23b. The new FIG. 4

enclosed herewith has eliminated this division of the display panel 12 into two sub-sections thus avoiding any question of new matter being introduced.

The new proposed FIG. 5 lodged earlier depicted both flat and angled displays being part of the same basket, which was said to be new matter. The new FIG. 5 enclosed herewith now shows only the integral display at one end of the basket (with no display at the other end).

There is no depiction of the angled display unit now required because claim 22, which claimed this feature, is deleted.

- The new FIGS. 4 and 5 therefore should overcome the objection to the previous new FIGS. 4 and 5 as set out in paragraph 2 of the Examiner's rejection of the drawings.

Also, the amendments to the claims and to the drawings overcome the objection to the drawings set out in paragraph No. 1 of the Examiner's rejection of the drawings. In particular:

- The complementary display units of claim 11 are depicted in FIG. 4;
- Claim 12 as now proposed to be amended a second time refers only to the display unit having a display panel (numeral 12 in the drawings) which is clearly supported by the drawings;
- The display unit being integral with the carry basket is depicted in FIG. 5. This was not rejected by the Examiner in relation to the previously proposed new FIG. 5 as constituting new matter.
- Claim 23 which previously defined the display unit mounted on the side of the carry basket is now amended to define only display units at the ends of the carry basket and this is depicted in new FIG. 4 (as discussed above in reference to the passage from page 3, line 22 to page 4, line 2, this is not new subject matter).

Therefore we believe the proposed new FIGS. 4 and 5 should be allowable and they provide basis for features in the claims that the Examiner said did not have basis in the drawings previously.

Specification:

Pages 6 and 8 of the specification were proposed to be amended but these pages were not allowed because they included new matter according to paragraph 3 of the Examiner's final report. The basis for this was the same as the basis for the rejection of the earlier new drawings.

We enclose new pages 6 and 8 which are consistent with the proposed new FIGS. 4 and 5. These new pages we believe should be allowable because, like the drawings, they no longer refer to features which the Examiner asserted constituted new matter.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/4/04



Margaret Polson
Reg. No. 42,082
Patent Law Offices of Rick Martin, P.C.
416 Coffman Street
Longmont, CO 80501
(303) 651-2177